

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 5, 10, 12-14, 16-17, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,648,793) in view of Miyahara et al. (US 6,075,507). Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Asada et al. (US 5,867,141). Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Iino et al. (US 5,900,856). Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Miyahara et al. and further in view of Hirai et al. (US 5,874,933). Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant cancels claims 16-20. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are pending for consideration.

Request for Withdrawal of Finality

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has failed to address Applicant's arguments presented in the Amendment filed on August 7, 2006, although the prior art rejections have been maintained in the Final Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner has failed to rebut Applicant's arguments directed toward the pre-charging controller allegedly disclosed by Miyahara et al. in claims 5, 10, and 12-13. As directed by MPEP 707.07(f), "[w]here the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument **and answer the substance of it**" (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Examiner has not addressed Applicant's arguments set

forth in the Amendment filed on August 7, 2006. Thus, Applicant further asserts that the finality of the Final Office Action dated October 11, 2006 should be withdrawn in order for Applicant to receive proper answers to the arguments set forth in their Amendment filed on August 7, 2006, and reiterated below.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without acquiescing to the Final Office Action's position that claims 16-20 fail to comply with the written description requirement, Applicant has canceled claims 16-20 in order to advance prosecution of the present application.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Independent claims 1, 5, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (US 5,648,793) in view of Miyahara et al. (US 6,075,507). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1, as previously presented, recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display panel including steps of *supplying a first gate start pulse and a second gate start pulse*. Independent claims 5 and 10, as previously presented, each recite *a pre-charging controller to generate the first and second gate start pulses*. The Office Action admits that Chen fails to disclose supplying gate start pulses to conduct data supplying channels, a data/gate driving integrated circuit, and a pre-charging controller. However, the Examiner alleges that Miyahara et al. discloses "a timing generator circuit (5 in FIG. 4) that supplies gate start pulses (Vsync and CLK) to a gate driver that in response generate pulses on gate electrodes (col. 6, lines 1-10)." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the two control signals Vsync and VCLK, shown in FIG. 4 of Miyahara et al., do not correspond to the first and second gate start pulses output from the pre-charging controller 11. Applicant respectfully asserts, rather, that the two signals rather correspond to the pre-gate start pulse (Pre-GSP) and the data output enable signal (DOE) input to the pre-charging controller 11, as shown in FIG. 6 of the present invention.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that Miyahara et al. also fails to teach or suggest at least these features of supplying gate start pulses to conduct data supplying channels, a data/gate driving integrated circuit, and a pre-charging controller, as required in independent claims 1, 5, and 10.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Chen and Miyahara et al., taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above feature of independent claims 1, 5, and 10. In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that Asada et al., Iino et al., and Hirai et al. whether taken singly or in combination, fail to remedy the deficiencies of Chen and Miyahara et al., since they are all completely silent as to first and second gate start pulses. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent claims 1, 5, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Chen in view of Miyahara et al., and hence the rejection of dependent claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: January 10, 2007

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000